

SECRET

Executive Registry

46-3837/A

1 JUL 1966

✓

The Honorable Dean Rusk
Secretary of State
Department of State
Washington, D. C.

Dear Dean:

I have your memorandum of June 23, requesting comments on revised articles for a U.S. Non-Proliferation Treaty.

It seems to me that most of the issues involved in the proposed changes are matters of policy, and of primary concern to the Department of State, the Department of Defense, and the Atomic Energy Commission. I understand, however, that the new language is not intended to bar the MLF, the ANF, or similar alliance arrangements. If so, the Soviets are not likely to find it more acceptable than the language it replaces.

It cannot be excluded, however, as you suggested at the recent meeting of the Principals, that the Soviets are now willing to gamble that the MLF is dead and to sign a non-proliferation treaty which permits the MLF. If such is the case, the new language could provide the Soviets with a face saving means of adhering to a non-proliferation treaty satisfactory to us.

CONCUR:

Sincerely,

/s/ Richard Helms

Richard Helms
Director

Distribution:

Orig & 1 - forward

2 - DCI

1 - Exec Registry

1 - DD/I

1 - DDS&T (Mr. [redacted])

1 - D/OSI

1 - O/NE

1 - [redacted]

2 - [redacted]

HS/HC-875

Approved For Release 2001/08/22 : CIA-RDP84-00499R000200170001-6

x 6710 (29 Jun 66)

EXECUTIVE REGISTRY FILE

25X1A

25X1A

25X1A

66-2827/1

29 June 1966

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Central Intelligence
THROUGH : Deputy Director for Intelligence *Ewp*
SUBJECT : Revised Articles for U.S. Non-
Proliferation Treaty

1. Paragraph 8 contains a recommendation for action.

2. At the meeting of the Committee of Principals on 17 June, Secretary Rusk noted that the Deputy Chief of the Soviet delegation at Geneva, Vorontsov, had said that the crux of the problem of non-proliferation was "physical access" to nuclear weapons by West Germany, and had indicated that a U.S. amendment to cover physical access would be an important move. The Secretary said that he would be circulating new treaty language embodying this phrase. A draft of the new language is attached. Also attached is a copy of the present U.S. draft treaty, and a cable from Geneva reporting Vorontsov's remarks.

3. The revised articles do not necessarily constitute a complete treaty by themselves; they directly replace only Articles I, II, and VI of the present draft. The remaining articles could be retained, but the Secretary does not make clear whether and to what extent this would be done. Nor is his staff clear on this point.

4. The U.S. will take the position that barring "physical access" to nuclear weapons does not rule out the MLF, the ANF, and similar alliance arrangements because such arrangements do not confer physical access. Thus, the new language represents no concession on this issue. It remains doubtful, therefore, that the Soviets will buy it, because they apparently remain adamant in opposing what they consider to be a German finger on the nuclear trigger.

SECRET

5. If this is so, the new language will not break the log jam at Geneva. It might, however, demonstrate to the world a U.S. desire to reach meaningful disarmament agreements and a U.S. willingness to go as far as possible in meeting Soviet wishes, and thus place the onus for lack of progress on the USSR. On the negative side, the new language might make it more difficult for the U.S. to defend the NLF than the language it replaces.

6. It is just possible that the Soviets are now ready to do business on our terms, but need some apparent concession to save face. As the Secretary put it at the meeting of the Principals, the Soviets might be willing to gamble that the NLF is dead, whether or not we acknowledge that our non-proliferation treaty bars it.

7. The issues involved here are largely those of policy and the primary concern of State, Defense, and the AEC. The attached reply to Secretary Rusk has been drafted accordingly.

8. It is recommended that you sign the attached letter to the Secretary.



25X1A

Attachments:

1. Letter for signature
2. Revised articles of treaty
3. Draft treaty (22 Mar 66 revision)
4. State Incoming cable 2502 from Geneva

Distribution:

Orig & 1 - DCI w/all atts

1 - Exec Registry w/o atts

1 - DD/I w/o atts

1 - DDS&T w/o atts

1 - D/OSI w/o atts

w/o atts
o atts

:mb (29 Jun 66) x 6710

25X1A

TRANSMITTAL SLIP		DATE 10/ /68
TO: [REDACTED]		
ROOM NO. 7 E 62	BUILDING	
REMARKS: Per your request. This copy may be retained or destroyed.		
FROM: Eunice/ER		
ROOM NO.	BUILDING	EXTENSION

FORM NO. 241
1 FEB 55

REPLACES FORM 36-B
WHICH MAY BE USED.

(47)

SECRET (When Filled In)

Approved For Release 2001/08/22 : CIA-RDP84-00499R000200170001-6			DOCUMENT
AREA OR COUNTRY(S)	ORGANIZATION	TITLE	DATE:
	DCI	Treaty	29 Jun 66
	State	Agreement	1 Jul 66
			CLASS.S
			NO.:
IDENTIFICATION OF DOCUMENT (author, form, addressee, title & length)			LOCATION:
1. Letter to The Honorable Dean Rusk from Richard Helms, DCI dated 1 July 1966.			
25X1A2. Memo for DCI from [REDACTED] dated 20 Jun 66, sub: Revised Articles for US Non-Proliferation Treaty.			HS/HC-875 ✓

ABSTRACT

Letter and memo discuss revised articles for US Non-Proliferation Treaty.

Approved For Release 2001/08/22 : CIA-RDP84-00499R000200170001-6

HS/HC-875

Place car bright in place of charged out folder
00499R000200170000y-8 n returned file folder.

Approved For Release 2001/08/22 : CIA-RDP84-

CHARGE TO

DATE _____

CHARGE TO

DATE _____

Approved For Release 2001/08/22 : CIA-RDP84T00040R0000200170001-6

INSTRUCTIONS

Place card upright in place of charged out folder
00499R000200170001-6 on returned file folder.

Approved For Release 2001/08/22 : CIA-RDP84-

[illegible]

Approved For Release 64557/108/E2 CHARGE PAGE 0000000200170001-6